

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents. Further, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that he has considered the references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted to the PTO on January 24, 2001. As a final matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the seven (7) sheets of formal drawings filed on March 21, 2001 have been accepted.

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims.

Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasamoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,912,969) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,544). Additionally, claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasamoto in view of Lee, and additionally, in view of B. Schneier, “Applied Cryptography” (Section 1.1, pg. 3, ¶ 4, “Symmetric Algorithms”). Finally, claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasamoto in view of Lee, and in addition, in further view of Ansell (U.S. Patent No. 6,367,019).

Claim 3 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 1 to delete the term “unique” as it relates to first and second information items. Further, for consistency, Applicant has also deleted this term from claims 2, 8 and 10. Applicant submits that these amendments are merely for clarification, do not narrow the scope of any claims and are not made in view of any prior art. Applicant therefore

respectfully suggests that the Examiner's § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 3 should be withdrawn.

A. Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7-11 (§ 103(a), Sasamoto in View of Lee)

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, a unique information storage means for storing a first information item (an encryption key) and a second information item (a decoding key) that corresponds to the first unique information item..

The Examiner asserts that Sasamoto discloses an information storage means for storing a first information item that specifies a pre-designated information encryption device, an encryption means for encrypting distributed information that has been received with the first information item as an encryption key, and a decoding means for decoding the information that has been encrypted by the encryption means.

The Examiner admits that Sasamoto fails to teach a second information item that corresponds to the first information item and is used as a decoding key. To supply this missing element, the Examiner asserts that Lee teaches a second information item that corresponds to the first information item and is, as well, used as a decoding key. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses this rejection.

Initially, with respect to independent claim 1, the unique information storage means stores both a first information item and a second information item (which corresponds to the first information item). Accordingly, Sasamoto fails to disclose the unique information storage means of independent claim 1 (namely, a storage means for storing both first and second

information items). Accordingly, the Examiner's asserted combination would not result in Applicant's invention, as recited in independent claim 1.

Even if the only element missing from Sasamoto is the second information item which corresponds to the first information item (and which is used as a decoding key), Lee fails to supply this element. Instead, Lee teaches double encryption of a serial number. That is, initially a serial number is encrypted with key B. (Step 106). Second, the encrypted serial number and key B are then both encrypted with key A. (Step 112). As a result, the serial number is double encrypted.

To decrypt the serial number, Lee reverses these steps. The double encrypted serial number along with encrypted key B are decrypted using key A. Then, the encrypted serial number is decrypted using the now-decrypted key B. This results in the decryption of the serial number.

Nowhere in Lee is there any disclosure, teaching or suggestion that key A has any correspondence to key B such that key A can be used alone to decrypt information that has been encrypted by key B. Similarly, there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Lee that key B could be used alone to decrypt information which has been only encrypted using key A. Therefore, Lee fails to disclose, teach or suggest the asserted missing element of a second information item that corresponds to a first information item and which is used as a decoding key, as recited in both independent claims 1 and 11. As such, the Examiner's asserted combination of Sasamoto and Lee cannot be supported.

As a final matter, the motivation asserted by the Examiner is not relevant to the problem solved by the Applicant. Instead, the motivation asserted by the Examiner is merely the problem addressed by Lee. Further, the motivation disclosed only in Lee does not logically call for the combination of Sasamoto and Lee. Simply put, neither reference, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests the required motivation for the asserted combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully suggests that the Examiner's asserted combination is not supported. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 11 remain patentable. Since claims 2-10 depend from independent claim 1, these claims are also patentable for the same reasons as set out above with respect to independent claim 1.

B. Remaining § 103(a) Rejections of Claims 3 and 6

The remaining § 103(a) rejections of claims 3 and 6 rely on the combination of Sasamoto and Lee. As discussed above, Applicant submits that this combination is improper. Since the additional references cited by the Examiner do not supply, or even address, the elements missing from Sasamoto and Lee, dependent claims 3 and 6 remain patentable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/768,154

Q62762

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Halber

Eric P. Halber
Registration No. 46,378

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 8, 2004